

REMARKS

Claims 27, 29-31, 34, 36-39, 48-56 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-22 are printed because the present application is a continuation of a re-issue application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections and objections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

Applicants submit that the amendments and remarks included herein constitute a complete response to the Office Action mailed March 3, 2006. Applicants are also including a Supplemental Declaration with this amendment. Applicants submit that the Supplemental Declaration, in addition to the amendments and remarks included herein, place the present application in condition for allowance.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

Examiner states Claims 27, 29-31 stand objected to because of the following informalities: In Claim 29, line 13, "a relatively" should be "relatively". This objection is respectfully traversed.

During a telephone interview with the Examiner, the Examiner confirmed that the objection was to an agreement of a tense. Thus, Claims 29 and 48 have been non-narrowingly amended to delete "components" and replace – component – therefore. This corrects the tense agreement and overcomes the objection.

Applicant submits that support for the amendments to Claims 48 and 49 can be found in the originally filed application, such as in Claim 13 of the U.S. Patent No. 5,592,939, which is the issued patent upon which the present application is a re-issue.

DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTION

Claims 48, 50, 51, 53 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as claiming the same invention as that of Claims 4-6, 11 of prior U.S. Patent No. 5,592,939. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants thank the Examiner for the interview granted with Applicants' representative on May 23, 2006. During the interview, Applicants' representative noted that the double-patenting rejection was made on U.S. Patent No. 5,592,939. Applicants' representative explained that the '939 patent is the patent upon which the present application is based and the present application is a re-issue application of the '939 patent. Therefore, the '939 patent will be surrendered upon allowance of the present application and the double patenting rejection appears to be improper. The Examiner agreed that the double patenting rejection should be removed in light of the present application being a re-issue of the '939 patent.

Therefore, Applicants request that the Examiner remove the double patenting rejection and allow each of the presently pending claims.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicants thank the Examiner for the indication of allowance of Claims 34, 36-39, 52, and 56.

The Examiner states that Claims 49, 54, 55 stand objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.


The Examiner also states that Claims 27, 29-31 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the objections set forth in this Office Action.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2006

By: 
Richard W. Warner, Reg. No. 38,043
Michael L. Taylor, Reg. No. 50,521

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

SJF/RWW/MLT/jmg